

REMARKS

The Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for discussing this case on April 4, 2007. During that discussion, the Applicant proposed amending claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of claims 5 and 6, as has now been done.

Claims 5 and 6 cover the embodiment shown in Figs. 2 and 3 of the present application wherein multiple arms extend from the movable beam and the multiple arms are electrically connected (in series as shown in Fig. 2 or in parallel as shown in Fig. 3) to boost the electrical power generated by the device. It is believed that this structure, which significantly increases the complexity of the device, would not be fairly suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art viewing prior art sensors which, while inherently producing small amounts of electricity, are not intended to provide substantial isolated electrical power.

Claim 1 has also been amended to correct minor antecedent basis problems noted by the Applicant.

In light of these remarks and amendments, it is believed that claim 1, and claims 10-21 dependent on claim 1, are now in condition for allowance and allowance is respectfully requested.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD D. HARRIS ET AL.

By: 

Keith M. Baxter  
Reg. No. 31,233  
Attorney for Applicant  
Boyle Fredrickson Newholm Stein & Gratz, S.C.  
250 East Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1030  
Milwaukee, WI 53202